



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/624,445	07/24/2000	Stephen Uhler	P5297/RSH	5723

32615 7590 04/08/2004

OSHA NOVAK & MAY L.L.P./SUN
1221 MCKINNEY, SUITE 2800
HOUSTON, TX 77010

EXAMINER

ANYA, CHARLES E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2126

DATE MAILED: 04/08/2004

14

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/624,445

Applicant(s)

UHLER ET AL.

Examiner

Charles E Anya

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,6-9,11 and 13-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,6-9,11 and 13-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-3,6-9,11and 13-28 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1 – 3,6 – 9,11,13 – 19 and 21 – 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,233,622 to Atsatt et al. in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,529,936 B1 to Mayo et al. and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,995,975 to Malcolm.**

4. As to claim 1, Atsatt teaches a framework for creating an extensible Web application, comprising: a server object configured to receive a request for the a extensible Web application (Web Demon 20 Col. 3 Ln. 1 – 67, Adapter 22 Col. 3 Ln. 11 – 54, Server 16 Col. 3 Ln. 1 – 67), a request object configured to be called by the server object upon receiving the request (Request Object 26 Col. 4 Ln. 28 – 67), a first handler object, configured to respond to the request using the request object (Handler 24 (24a, 24b, 24c) Col. 3 Ln. 19 – 67, Col. 4 Ln. 1 – 67).

Art Unit: 2126

5. Atsatt is silent with reference to a properties object comprising information used by the first handler object, the server object and the request object to respond to the request and the properties object includes a data dictionary.

6. Mayo teaches a properties object comprising information used by the first handler object, the server object and the request object to respond to the request (Objects 32 – 32n, Object 50 Col. 7 Ln. 20 – 67, Col. 8 Ln. 1 – 67, Properties 84 – 86 Col. 9 Ln. 1 – 13, "...argument-name...argument-value..." Col. 8 Ln. 1 – 55).

7. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Mayo and Atsatt because the teaching of Mayo would improve the system of Atsatt by providing a unit of distribution for the objects (Mayo Col. 7 Ln. 61 – 67).

8. Malcolm teaches the properties object to include a data dictionary (figures 4A/B Col. 6 Ln. 5 – 67, Col. 7 Ln. 1 – 67, Col. 8 Ln. 1 – 67).

9. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Malcolm and Atsatt because the teaching of Malcolm would improve the system of Atsatt by providing location information (Malcolm Col. 7 Ln. 44 – 67).

10. As to claim 2, Although an initialization method and a handler name is not explicitly taught these limitations are inherent because in order for the handler object to process a request resources (e.g. memory), it must have to be allocated to the handler

object and the handler object inherently has an identifier otherwise it would be impossible for the adapter object to pass the request object to the handler object.

11. As to claim 3, Atsatt teaches the step of the handler object creating/instantiating additional/second handler object (Handler 24 Col. 4 Ln. 1 – 9, IRemoteHandler Col. 10 Ln. 1 – 9).

12. As to claim 6, Atsatt as modified is silent with reference to the first handler object is configured to modify the properties object to obtain a modified request object.

13. Mayo teaches the first handler object is configured to modify the properties object to obtain a modified request object (Col. 9 Ln. 11 – 13).

14. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Mayo and Atsatt because the teaching of Mayo would improve the system of Atsatt by promoting code reuse (Mayo Col. 9 Ln. 11 – 13).

15. As to claim 7, Atsatt teaches a method of operating a web application comprising the step of creating a server object (Col. 9 Ln. 16 – 25), the step of creating a handler object (Col. 4 Ln. 12 – 17, Block 36 Col. 5 Ln. 1 – 7), receiving an indication of a request (Col. 3 Ln. 37 – 47), creating a request object in response to receiving the indication (Col. 4 Ln. 31 – 35: NOTE: Atsatt does not explicitly show the step of creating a request object in response to receiving the indication however this is inherent because the

adapter receives the input data before the creation of a request object), a response method (Block 46 Col. 5 Ln. 37 – 41) and the step of calling methods of the request object to obtain the request at the port (Col. 4 Ln. 46 – 50: NOTE: A port is inherent because the URLs includes port number that a web server is running on). And see the rejection of claim 1.

16. As to claim 8, see the rejection of claim 3.

17. As to claim 9, claims 1 and 7 meets claim 9 except for the step of waiting for a request for aggregated content.

Atsatt is silent with reference to this limitation, however, Atsatt teaches IRemoteHandler that could forward requests to a second handler object (Col. 10 Ln. 1 – 9). By some doing the handler object would be chained and as the response is returned along the chain an aggregate content would be accumulated.

18. As to claims 11 and 13, see the rejection of claims 3 and 9.

19. As to claim 14, see the rejection of claim 1.

20. As to claim 15, Atsatt teaches the step where a handler object is called to respond to a request embodied in the request object (Col. 4 Ln. 42 – 50).

Art Unit: 2126

21. As to claim 16, claims 3 and 9 meets claim 16 except for the step of exchanging information via the properties object. For this limitation see the rejection of claims 3 and 9.

22. As to claim 17, see the rejection of claim 1.

23. As to claim 18, see the rejection of claims 3 and 9.

24. As to claim 19, claims 1 and 6 meets claim 19 except for responding to requests based on the properties object.

Mayo teaches the step of responding to requests based on the properties object ("property-name..." Col. 8 Ln. 7 – 18).

25. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Mayo and Atsatt because the teaching of Mayo would improve the system of Atsatt by determining the interface to a function that a request would be routed to (Mayo Col. 8 Ln. 7 – 18).

26. As to claim 21, Atsatt teaches the request object being configured to obtain and parse the request (Request Object 26 Col. 4 Ln. 10 – 67).

27. As to claim 22, see the rejection of claim 3.

28. As to claim 23, Atsatt teaches the request object that includes information related to the request (Request Object Col. 4 Ln. 31 – 40).

29. As to claim 24, see the rejection of claim 6.

30. As to claim 25, see the rejection of claim 1.

31. As to claim 26, Atsatt teaches formulating a response to the request (...response..." Col. 3 Ln. 54 – 65, Reply Object 28 Col. 4 Ln. 11 – 50).

32. As to claim 27, Atsatt teaches a method for processing a request from a web application comprising: receiving a the request by the server object (Web Demon 20 Col. 3 Ln. 1 – 67, Adapter 22 Col. 3 Ln. 11 – 54, Server 16 Col. 3 Ln. 1 – 67), generating a request object to manage processing of the request (Request Object 26 Col. 4 Ln. 28 – 67), forwarding the request using a handler object/processing the request using the handler object (Handler 24 (24a, 24b, 24c) Col. 3 Ln. 19 – 67, Col. 4 Ln. 1 – 67), processing the request using the handler object comprises sequentially invoking a plurality of interior node handler objects, wherein each of the plurality of interior handler objects processes a portion of the request to obtain a partial result and storing the partial result in a properties object (Col. 10 Ln. 1 – 8). Also see the rejection of claim 1.

33. As to claim 28, see the rejection of claim 27.

34. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,144,990 to Brandt et al. in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,529,936 B1 to Mayo et al. and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,995,975 to Malcolm.

35. As to claim 20, Brandt teaches a Device (Computer System 340/FlowMark 450 Col. 13 Ln. 28 – 47), an HTTP Request (“...URL...” Col. 12 Ln. 51 – 67, Col. 16 Ln. 1 – 3), a Requester (Web Browser 212 Col. 12 Ln. 51 – 67), extracting request in from the HTTP request (Col. 12 Ln. 66 – 67, Col. 13 Ln. 1 – 8), Command (“...command...” Col. 13 Ln. 1 – 53), a Handler Object (FMIG 430 Col. 13 Ln. 14 – 22), invoking the commands on the device (Col. 13 Ln. 34 – 43), receiving device information from the device (“...receive...” Col. 13 Ln. 43 – 47) and returning device information to the requester (Col. 14 Ln. 10 – 32).

36. Brandt is silent with reference to using information from a properties object and wherein the properties objects include a data dictionary.

37. Mayo teaches using information from a properties object (“...http://...” Col. 7 Ln. 61 – 67, Col. 8 Ln. 1 – 18).

38. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Mayo and Brandt because the teaching of Mayo would improve the system of Brandt by sending a request and returning a result to a requester (Mayo Col. 8 Ln. 1 – 18).

Art Unit: 2126

39. Malcolm teaches the properties object to include a data dictionary (figures 4A/B Col. 6 Ln. 5 – 67, Col. 7 Ln. 1 – 67, Col. 8 Ln. 1 – 67).

40. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Malcolm and Brandt because the teaching of Malcolm would improve the system of Brandt by providing location information (Malcolm Col. 7 Ln. 44 – 67).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles E Anya whose telephone number is (703) 305-3411. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-6:00) First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, An Meng-Ai can be reached on (703) 305-9678. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Charles E Anya

Application/Control Number: 09/624,445
Art Unit: 2126

Page 10

Examiner
Art Unit 2126

cea



MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100